

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 17-48 are withdrawn. Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims.

The examiner uses Alexander to reject claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-14 as having been anticipated.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "changing a subject matter displayed on the video screen so that the video screen displays a second television program segment, wherein after said changing of the subject matter, the video screen comprises a window region continuing to display an indication of the first television program segment simultaneously in a main program screen with the second television program segment." Alexander neither describes nor suggests at least this quoted claim feature.

Alexander discloses an electronic programming guide (EPG) that has a picture-in-picture window for displaying real time video for a last channel viewed or displaying a panel ad video for a last channel viewed:

The viewer enters the Guide Mode illustrated in FIG. 1 by "select" key. A real time television program is displayed in window 12. (Alexander, col. 3, lines 56-58)

Clearly this fails to describe or suggest at least "changing a subject matter displayed on the video screen so that the video screen displays a second television program segment," as claimed in claim 1.

There are generally three results to leaving the Guide, depending upon the way the viewer leaves the Guide. If the viewer, while in the EPG, wants to watch in full screen mode the program shown in the PIP Window, then the viewer can press the Guide button on the remote control device. If the viewer, while in the EPG, highlights a particular channel in the Grid Guide, and then presses the "select" button, the viewer will leave the Guide to view in the full screen mode the television program that the viewer highlighted in the Guide. If the viewer, while in the EPG, presses the "clear" or "cancel" button on the remote control device, then the viewer will leave the Guide and return to the television program that the viewer was watching immediately before entering the Guide. (Alexander, col. 4, lines 13-27)

Alexander simply discloses moving in and out of an EPG, and fails to describe or suggest "wherein after said changing of the subject matter, the video screen comprises a window region continuing to display an indication of the first television program segment simultaneously in a main program screen with the second television program segment." Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Alexander.

Claim 11, as amended, recites "providing additional signal information to be displayed in a window on a video screen while simultaneously displaying information other than said first video program if a viewer changes a channel." Alexander neither describes nor suggests this claimed feature. Alexander does nothing in response to changing channels, only something with respect to EPG activities. Accordingly, claim 11, as amended, is not anticipated by Alexander.

The examiner uses Alexander and Berezowski to reject claims 3, 6, 15 and 16 as having been obvious.

As described above, Alexander fails to teach or suggest "changing a subject matter displayed on the video screen so that the video screen displays a second television program segment, wherein after said changing of the subject matter, the video screen comprises a window region continuing to display an indication of the first television program segment simultaneously in a main program screen with the second television program segment," as claimed in claim 1. Berezowski does not provide for the deficiencies of Alexander. Berezowski merely teaches an adjustable EPG:

A television program guide system is provided in which the relative sizes of the promotional information and program listings regions can be adjusted in real time to provide different display formats. (Berezowski, Abstract)

This is very different from "changing a subject matter displayed on the video screen so that the video screen displays a second television program segment, wherein after said changing of the subject matter, the video screen comprises a window region continuing to display an indication

of the first television program segment simultaneously in a main program screen with the second television program segment."

Assuming that there is a suggestion to combine Alexander and Berezowski, and there is no such suggestion, the resulting combination would only lead to an adjustable EPG with a PIP window. Accordingly, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Alexander and Berezowski, whether taken separately or in combination.

Claims 3 and 6 depend upon, and add further limitations to, claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3 and 6 are not rendered obvious by Alexander and Berezowski, whether taken separately or in combination.

Alexander fails to teach or suggest "providing additional signal information to be displayed in a window on a video screen while simultaneously displaying information other than said first video program if a viewer changes a channel," as claimed in claim 11. Here again, Berezowski does not provide for the deficiencies of Berezowski, as described above with reference to claim 1. Accordingly, claim 11 is not rendered obvious by Alexander and Berezowski, whether taken separately or in combination.

Claims 15 and 16 depend upon, and add further limitations to, claim 11. Accordingly, claims 15 and 16 are not rendered obvious by Alexander and Berezowski, whether taken separately or in combination.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as

Applicant : Yakov Kamen et al.
Serial No. : 09/449,016
Filed : November 24, 1999
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 091451.00111

an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Respectfully submitted,


Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

Date: February 6, 2006

Holland & Knight LLP
10 St. James Avenue
Boston, MA 02116
Telephone: (617) 573-5879
Facsimile: (617) 523-5850

3494652_v1